# Ecofeminism K

## Framework

#### Ecofeminism provides a new perspective that would otherwise be lost, making it necessary to weigh it as a factor in this debate.

Schmonsky 12

(Jessica, *The Growing Importance of Ecofeminism,* October 22 2012, http://www.izilwane.org/the-growing-importance-of-ecofeminism.html)

There are countless ways of viewing the environment. In modern societies, it is important to consider the ways in which we connect with nature as industrial practices move us away from the earth and as biodiversity is lost. Pollution is on the rise, and people all over the world are suffering the consequences of projects constructed in the name of progress. Ecofeminism offers a way of thinking and organizing ourselves by encouraging interconnectedness with our environment and addressing the subjugation of women and marginalized peoples. As a result of this kind of thinking and organizing, new human and environmental [connections](http://www.izilwane.org/) can be made with a broader perspective, involving less overt social recognitions. Categorizing women and subjugated peoples with the environment allows for the recognition of social and environmental injustices from a unique and often forgotten perspective, which in turn allows for solidarity and solace.

#### Raises questions that would otherwise be ignored under the aff’s gender-biased point of view.

Warren 96 --- Prof of Philosophy at Macalester College

(Karren, *Ecological Feminist Philosophies: An Overview of the Issues,* June 1996, http://www.vedegylet.hu/okopolitika/Warren%20-%20Ecofeminism%20Overview.pdf)

In the preceding I have identified eight sorts of connections alleged by ecofeminists and ecofeminist philosophers between feminism and the environment. I have indicated why and how, if indeed there are these connections feminism, environmentalism, and environmental ethics will need to take them seriously. What are some of the implications of these connections for mainstream philosophy? I suggest a few here. The conceptual links (given above at 2) suggest that philosophical conceptions of the self, knowledge and the "knower," reason and rationality, objectivity, and "nature versus culture"-mainstay philosophical notions in ethics, epistemology, metaphysics, philosophy of science, history of philosophy, political philosophy-will need to be reconceived. The value dualisms which seem to pervade the western philosophical tradition since the early Greeks (e.g., reason/emotion, mind/body, culture/nature, human/nature) and the historical sex-gendered association of women with emotion, body, and nature will need to be examined for male-gender bias. The historical and empirical links (given at 1 and 3, above) suggest that social scientific dam on women and the environment is relevant to the theoretical undertakings in many areas of philosophy. In ethics, for example, this data on women and nature raises issues of anthropocentric and androcentric bias. Can mainstream normative ethical theories generate an environmental ethic which is not male biased? In epistemology, data on the "indigenous technical knowledge" (see Warren I988) of women who globally constitute the main agricultural production force (e.g., at least 80 percent of the farmers in Africa are women) raises issues about women's "epistemic privilege" about farming and forestry (see Warren I988): If there is such privilege, does it generate the need for "feminist standpoint epistemologies," as some feminists have claimed (see Garry and Pearsall I989; Harding I986; Harding and Hintikka I983; Jaggar and Bordo 1989)? In metaphysics, data of the cross-cultural variability of "women-nature connections" raise issues about the concept of nature and the nature/cultural dichotomy. Is "nature" a given, a cross-cultural constant that stands in contrast to socially evolving and created ''culture,'' or is nature, like culture, a social construct? Even if there really are trees, rivers, and ecosystems, does the way nature is conceived and theorized about reflect historical, socioeconomic factors in much the same way that, according to many feminists, conceptions and theories about "humans" and "human nature" are constructed? In political philosophy, data about the inferior standards of living of women globally raise issues about political theories and theorizing. What roles do unequal distributions of power and privilege play in the maintenance of systems of domination over both women and nature? How do they affect the content and methodology of political theories and theorizing? In the history of philosophy, data on the historical inferiorization and associations of women and nature raises issues about the nature and substantive content of the philosophical theories advanced in any given time period: Do they inherit biases against women and nature which bear on the critical assessment of the theories themselves? In philosophy of science, particularly philosophy of biology, the data raise issues about the relationships between feminism and science, particularly ecology. As Carolyn Merchant asks, “Is there a set of assumptions basic to the science of ecology that also holds implications for the status of women? Is there an ecological ethic that is also a feminist ethic?” (Merchant 1985, 229). Are there important parallels between contemporary feminist environmental ethics and ecosystems ecology which suggests ways in which they are engaged in mutually supportive projects (see Y. King 1989; Warren and Cheney 1991)? These are the sort of questions raised by a philosophical look at the significance of issues concerning “feminism and the environment.”

#### That which we regard as “objective” still contains bias and requires vision through an ecofeminist lens.

Wall 12 --- Prof of Philosophy and Religion at University of Alberta

(Chloe, *The Nature of Knowledge: Toward an Ecofeminist Epistemology, Metamorphosis* Fall 2012)

What, then, is the alternative? If we are to shed entirely the notion of universal, disembodied knowledge and reason, then what remains is local, situated knowledge. This is not to say, however, that in the absence of universal knowledge we must settle for situated knowledge, which might be construed as being simply a matter of opinion. Rather, situated knowledge can in fact withstand tests of knowledge evaluation that universal knowledge cannot, and can do so more self-reflectively and authentically. For example, in traditional epistemology, the principle that objectivity is integral to knowledge is upheld, and it is endorsed as being value-free, neutral, and definitive. According to the feminist philosopher Sandra Harding, however, even the knowledge we laud as "objective" is incredibly value-laden. If the natural and social sciences are supposed to be value-free, why is there "a rampant sexist and androcentric bias [. . .] in the dominant scientific (and popular) descriptions and explanations of nature and social life? [. . .] How should one explain the surprising fact that politically guided research projects have been able to produce less partial and distorted results of research than those supposedly guided by the goal of value-neutrality?"9 For example, Lorraine Code points out that "Cynthia Russet documents the intellectual climate of the nineteenth century, when claims for racial and sexual equality were threatening upheavals in the social order. She notes that there was a concerted effort just at that time among scientists to produce studies that would demonstrate the 'natural' sources of racial and sexual inequality. Given its aptness to the climate of the times, it is hard to believe that this research was 'dislocated,' prompted by a disinterested spirit of objective, neutral fact-finding."10 Science, which we take as our paradigm for knowledge, is always socially interested and initiated. Sandra Harding argues that our traditional notion of objectivity is insufficient even for the goals it purports to accomplish. It does not effectively discard all values, and worse, the values that make it through the net are invisible.

#### An ecofeminist pedagogy allows for discussion about dominant practices and the possibility of an alternative.

Harvester 09 --- Bachelor of Education, Simon Fraser University

(Lara Jean, *Ecofeminist Pedagogy: Framework for Ecosocial Justice in Education*, Spring 2009)

An ecofeminist pedagogy needs to have a theoretical base that lacks domination, champions marginal voices (including that of more-than-human nature), and emphasizes identifying oneself in relation to others (both human and more-than-human). Teaching through an ecofeminist lens means that issues of social and ecological justice are paramount, thus ecofeminist pedagogy is ecosocial in theory and practice. Ecofeminist pedagogy must be critical in orientation if it is going to address social and ecological injustices. To be critical involves problematizing "the taken-for-granted assumptions, and unjust outcomes, of conventional educational and cultural practices" (Funnan & Gruenewald, 2004, p. 58). Ecofeminism provides a place from which educators can question dominant discourses and practices, and interrupt hegemonic power relations in schools (Houde & Bullis, 2000). Ecofeminist educators set themselves two principal tasks: to expose the logic of domination and to seek alternatives that replace this destructive way of relating to each other and nature (Hallen, 2000). There is certainly no lack of places where ecofeminist pedagogy can start to challenge the logic of domination in education. Deciding which places would provide the most fertile ground for change would be a start. These places would be different depending on the teacher, school, students, and political climate. Wherever an ecofeminist educator decides to start, they act "in the hope that the resultant splash and ripples cause a dissonance that impels the larger pool of education to change shape in response" (Blenkinsop & Beeman, 2008, p.85). To work for change is an act of hope, a trust that the process will bring about the desired results. I feel a deep need for this hope, especially when trying to change deeply entrenched ways of being-in-the-world that are undergirded by a logic of domination. This thesis is, in part, an act of hope for me: hope that approaching education from an ecofeminist, ecosocial justice, perspective will help me be a positive agent of much-needed change in education. I would aim to be one of hopefully many "nuclei" for a new system, where these nucleus act as attractors for a new system which then grows in influence. Eisler argues that fundamental change is possible, even within a relatively short timeframe, when enough "nodules for change come together as the nucleus...for a new system" (2000, p. 249). These fundamental changes need to be mostly second-order change, which alters the ways in which education is put together, including new goals, structures, and roles (Steen, 2003)."

#### Ecofeminism aims for social change and in doing so invites conflict, allowing for good debate as well as providing an effective framework.

Harvester 09 --- Bachelor of Education, Simon Fraser University

(Lara Jean, *Ecofeminist Pedagogy: Framework for Ecosocial Justice in Education*, Spring 2009)

Ecofeminism, and thus ecofeminist pedagogy, aims to disrupt hegemonic power relations. Doing this invites questions and perhaps conflict, partly because people may have a sense of duty to the prevailing system and so defend it against detractors (Leppanen. 2M4). Conflict and crisis should not take the ecofeminist educator by surprise. It is to be expected. Ecofeminist, anti-oppressive, and critical pedagogy are all overtly political and deal with controversial issues, and are thus likely to invite criticism from those desiring to uphold the status quo. Those committed to this course of action may face opposition, or at the very least, questions about their chosen theory and practice. Hence the need, for me at least, to feel adequately equipped to answer these questions, using the writing of this thesis (as a culmination of all that I have learned throughout the masters) as a starting point. While writing a thesis and then working for change in one's classroom might seem like a solitary activity, the building of cooperative and supportive alliances with other educators has been, and will continue to be, a key part of the process of examining my world-view and its effect on my theory and practice as an educator. Ecofeminist, anti-oppressive, and critical educators all aim for social and political change. This will not happen unless people recognize their own involvement in systems of oppression and find different ways to relate to each other (hooks, 1989) and more-than-human nature (Houde & Bullis, 1999). Coming to terms with this fact and doing some self-analysis before entering the classroom is a key part of preparing to teach within an ecofeminist pedagogy." Consider hooks: ''If we do not change our own consciousness, we cannot change our actions or demand change from others" (1989, p. 25). Furthermore, "Deep personal and political change requires more than an interruption of hegemonic power and rituals of resistance. It also entails recognizing one's own involvement within those systems of oppression and finding alternative practices that help people to live tranformationally" (Houde et. al., 1999, p. 151). As an ecofeminist teacher, I need to think deeply about how I act out the part of oppressor towards other humans and more-than-human nature, and then work towards appropriate changes in thinking and behaviour. As the Buddha is quoted as saying, "First, cease to do evil; then learn to do good." The first step for an ecofeminist teacher is to take time to see where s/he might be "doing evil" by acting under the influence of the logic of domination. Then do everything s/he can to stop that behaviour. Only after this first step has been taken should one begin to "learn to do good" by enacting an ecofeminist pedagogy which aims to break down the logic of domination and offer an alternative framework that does no (or at least as little as possible) evil.

## Links

### General

#### **Patriarchal frameworks perpetuate the dominations of women and nature**

Warren 1991 -- author, scholar, and former Professor and Chair of Philosophy at Macalester College

(Karen, Introduction to Ecofeminism, environmental.lilithezine.com)

1. Historical, Typically Causal, Connections. One alleged connection between women and nature is historical. When historical data are used to generate theories concerning the sources of the dominations of women and nature, it is also causal. So pervasive is the historical-causal theme in ecofeminist writing that Ariel Salleh practically defines ecofeminism in terms of it: "Eco-feminism is a recent development in feminist thought which argues that the current global environmental crisis is a predictable outcome of patriarchal culture" (Salleh 1988).¶ What are these alleged historical-causal connections? Some ecofeminists (e.g., Spretnak 1990; Eisler 1988, 1990) trace these connections to prototypical patterns of domination begun with the invasion of Indo-European societies by nomadic tribes from Eurasia about 4500 B.C. (see Lahar 1991, 33). Riane Eisler describes the time before these invasions as a "matrifocal, matrilineal, peaceful agrarian era." Others (e g., Griffin 1978; Plumwood 1991, this section; Ruether 1974) trace historical connections to patriarchal dualisms and conceptions of rationality in classical Greek philosophy and the rationalist tradition. Still other feminists (e g., Merchant 1980, this section focus on cultural and scientific changes that occurred more recently--during the scientific revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: it was then that an older world order characterized by cooperation between humans and nature was replaced by a reductionist, "mechanistic world view of modern science," which sanctioned the exploitation of nature, unchecked commercial and industrial expansion, and the subordination of women.¶ What prompts and explains these alleged historical and causal woman-nature connections? What else was in place to permit and sanction these twin dominations? To answer these questions, ecofeminists have turned to the conceptual props that they claim keep these historical dominations in place.¶ 2. Conceptual Connections. Many authors have argued that, ultimately, historical and causal links between the dominations of women and nature are located in conceptual structures of domination that construct women and nature in male-biased ways. Basically three such conceptual links have been offered.¶ One account locates a conceptual basis of the twin dominations of women and nature in value dualisms, i.e., in disjunctive pairs in which the disjuncts are seen as oppositional (rather than as complementary) and as exclusive (rather than as inclusive), and value hierarchies, i.e., perceptions of diversity organized by a spatial Up-Down metaphor, which attributes higher value (status, prestige) to that which is higher ("Up") (see Gray 1981; Griffin 1978, Plumwood 1991, this section; Ruether 1974). Frequently cited examples of these hierarchically organized value dualisms include reason/emotion, mind/body, culture/nature, human/nature, and man/woman dichotomies. These theorists argue that whatever is historically associated with emotion, body, nature, and women is regarded as inferior to that which is (historically) associated with reason, mind, culture, human (i.e., male) and men.¶ A second account expands on the first by housing the problematic value dualisms and value hierarchies in larger, oppressive conceptual frameworks--ones that are common to all social "isms of domination" (e.g., sexism, racism, classism, heterosexism as well as "naturism," i.e., the unjustified domination of nonhuman nature (see Warren 1987,1988, 1990, this section) A conceptual framework is a socially constructed set of basic beliefs, values, attitudes and assumptions that shapes and reflects how one views oneself and others. It is oppressive when it explains, justifies, and maintains relationships of domination and subordination. An oppressive conceptual framework is patriarchal when it explains, justifies, and maintains the subordination of women by men.¶ Oppressive and patriarchal conceptual frameworks are characterized not only by value dualisms and hierarchies but also by "power-over " conceptions of power and relationships of domination (Warren 1991b) and a logic of domination, i.e., a structure of argumentation that provides the moral premise that superiority justifies subordination (Warren 1987, 1990, this section). On this view, it is oppressive and patriarchal conceptual frameworks, and the behaviors that they give rise to, that sanction, maintain, and perpetuate the twin dominations of women and nature.¶ A third account locates a conceptual basis in sex-gender differences, particularly in differentiated personality formation or consciousness (see Cheney 1987; Gray 1981; Salleh, 1984). The claim is that female bodily experiences (e.g., of reproduction and childbearing), not female biology per se, situate women differently with respect to nature than men. This sex-gender difference is (allegedly) revealed in a different consciousness in women than men toward nature; lt is rooted conceptually in "paradigms that are uncritically oriented to the dominant western masculine forms of experiencing the world: the analytic, non-related, delightfully called 'objective' or 'scientific' approaches" (Salleh 1988, 130)--just those value dualisms that are claimed to separate and inferiorize what is historically female-gender identified. These sociopsychological factors provide a conceptual link insofar as they are embedded in different conceptualization structures and strategies ("different ways of knowing"), coping strategies and ways of relating to nature for women and men. A goal of ecofeminism then, is to develop gender-sensitive language, theory, and practices that do not further the exploitative experiences and habits of dissociated, male-gender identified culture toward women and nature.¶ One project of ecofeminism is to expose and dismantle the conceptual structures of domination which have kept various "isms of domination," particularly the dominations of women and nature, in place. If ecofeminists who allege various conceptual woman-nature connections are correct, this will involve reconceiving those mainstay philosophical notions which rely on them (e.g., notions of reason and rationality, knowledge, objectivity, ethics, and the knowing, moral self).

#### **Empirics and the language used to describe women and nature justify the domination of both**

Warren 1991 -- author, scholar, and former Professor and Chair of Philosophy at Macalester College

(Karen, Introduction to Ecofeminism, environmental.lilithezine.com)

Empirical and Experiential Connections. Many ecofeminists have focused on uncovering empirical evidence linking women (and children, people of color, the underclass) with environmental destruction. Some point to various health and risk factors borne disproportionately by women children, racial minorities and the poor caused by the presence of low-level radiation, pesticides, toxics, and other pollutants (e.g., Caldecott and Leland 1983; Salleh 1990, this section; Shiva 1988; Warren 1991a). Others provide data to show that First World development policies result in policies and practices regarding food, forest, and water, which directly contribute to the inability of women to provide adequately for themselves and their families (e.g., Mies 1986; Shiva 1988; Warren 1988, 1989 1991a). Feminist animal rights scholars argue that factory farming, animal experimentation, hunting, and meat eating are tied to patriarchal concepts and practices (e.g., Adams 1990, 1991; Kheel 1985; Slicer 1991). Some connect rape and pornography with male-gender identified abuse of both women and nature (e.g., Collard with Contrucci 1988; Griffin 1981). Appeal to such empirical data is intended both to document the very real, felt, lived "experiential" connections between the dominations of women and nature and to motivate the need for joining together feminist critical analysis and environmental concerns.¶ Sometimes, however, the empirical and experiential connections between women and nature are intended to reveal important cultural and spiritual ties to the earth honored and celebrated by (some) women and indigenous peoples. This suggests that some woman-nature connections are features of important symbol systems.¶ 4. Symbolic Connections. Some ecofeminists have explored the symbolic association and devaluation of women and nature that appears in religion, theology, art, and literature. Documenting such connections and making them integral to the project of ecofeminism is often heralded as ecofeminism's most promising contribution to the creation of liberating, life-affirming, and post patriarchal worldviews and earth-based spiritualities or theologies. Ecofeminism is then presented as offering alternative spiritual symbols (e.g., Gaia and goddess symbols), spiritualities or theologies, and even utopian societies (e.g., see Gearhart). Appreciating such symbolic woman-nature connections involves understanding "the politics of women's spirituality" (Spretnak 1981).¶ Some ecofeminist theorists draw on literature, particularly "nature writing," to unpack the nature of the woman-nature linguistic symbolic connections (see Bell 1988; Kolodny 1975; Murphy 1988, 1991). Literary criticism of the sort offered by Patrick Murphy claims that patriarchal conceptions of nature and women have justified "a two-pronged rape and domination of the earth and the women who live on it" (Murphy 1988, 87), often using this as background for developing an ecofeminist literary theory (Murphy 1991).¶ Some theorists focus on language, particularly the symbolic connections between sexist and naturist language, i.e., language that inferiorizes women and nonhuman nature by naturalizing women and feminizing nature. For example, there are concerns about whether sex-gendered language used to describe "Mother Nature" is, in Ynestra King's words, "potentially liberating or simply a rationale for the continued subordination of women" (Y. King 1981). There are concerns about connections between the languages used to describe women, nature, and nuclear weaponry (see Cahn 1989; Strange 1989). Women are often describe in animal terms (e.g., as cows, foxes, chicks, serpents, bitches, beavers, old bats, pussycats, cats, bird-brains, hare-brains). Nature is often described in female and sexual terms: nature is raped, mastered, conquered, controlled, mined. Her "secrets" are "penetrated" and her "womb" is put into the services of the "man of science." "Virgin timber" is felled, cut down. "Fertile soil" is tilled and land that lies "fallow" is "barren," useless. The claim is that language that so feminizes nature and naturalizes women describes, reflects, and perpetuates the domination and inferiorization of both by failing to see the extent to which the twin dominations of women and nature (including animals) are, in fact, culturally (and not merely figuratively) analogous. The development of theory and praxis in feminism and environmental philosophy that does not perpetuate such sexist-naturist language and the power over systems of domination they reinforce is, therefore, a goal of ecofeminism.

#### **The scientific revolution sanctioned the exploitation of nature and the subordination of women**

Warren 1991 -- author, scholar, and former Professor and Chair of Philosophy at Macalester College

(Karen, Introduction to Ecofeminism, environmental.lilithezine.com)

Historian of environmental science Carolyn Merchant published her highly influential book The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution in 1980. In it she argues that prior to the seventeenth century, nature was conceived on an organic model as a benevolent female and a nurturing mother; after the scientific revolution, nature was conceived on a mechanistic model as (mere) machine, inert, dead. On both models, nature was female. Merchant argues that the move from the organic to the mechanistic model permitted the justified exploitation of the (female) earth, by removing the sorts of barriers to such treatment that the metaphor of nature as alive previously prevented; the mechanistic worldview of modern science sanctioned the exploitation of nature, unrestrained commercial expansion, and socioeconomic conditions that perpetuated the subordination of women. The Death of Nature wove together scholarly material from politics, art, literature, physics, technology, philosophy and popular culture to show how this mechanistic worldvlew replaced an older, organic worldview, which provided gendered moral restraints on how one treated nature.¶ The essay by Merchant which appears in this section, "The Death of Nature," is culled from The Death of Nature. This essay represents an edited version of the philosophically significant aspects of Merchant's main argument in The Death of Nature; it sidesteps some of the more technical, literary, or scientific specifics that receive extensive attention in the book. Inclusion of the Merchant essay in this section ensures representation of an early and classic, although not universally accepted (see Plumwood 1986), historical ecofeminist position on the patriarchal source of the domination of nature.¶ In "Nature, Self, and Gender: Feminism, Environmental Philosophy, and the Critique of Rationalism," Val Plumwood argues that the key to woman-nature connections in the Western world is found in "rationalism," that long-standing philosophical tradition that affirms the human/nature dichotomy and a network of other related dualisms (e.g., masculine/femiine, reason/emotion, spirit/body) and offers an account of the human self as masculine and centered around rationality to the exclusion of its contrasts (especially characteristics regarded as feminine, animal, or natural). Plumwood criticizes both deep ecology and environmental philosophy generally for missing entirely the ecofeminist critique that "anthropocentrism and androcentrism are linked." She claims,¶ ¶ The failure to observe such connections is the result of an inadequate historical analysis and understanding of the way in which the inferiorization of both women and nature is grounded in rationalism, and the connections of both to the inferiorizing of the body, hierarchical concepts of labor, and disembedded and individualist accounts of the self.

### Economy Link

#### Calls for increased economic growth are intrinsically exploitative of women.

Mellor ’96 [Mary, professor of social science at Northumbria University. “THE POLITICS OF WOMEN AND NATURE: AFFINITY, CONTINGENCY OR MATERIAL RELATION?” <https://www.google.com/search?q=ecofeminism+and+technology&oq=ecofeminism+and+technology&aqs=chrome..69i57.8765j0j1&sourceid=chrome&es_sm=0&ie=UTF-8#q=mary+mellor&safe=active>]

For Merchant socialist ecofeminism sees environmental problems as 'rooted in the rise of capitalist patriarchy and the ideology that the Earth and nature can be exploited for human progress through technology'.[ [64](https://stuiterproxy.kuleuven.be/ehost/,DanaInfo=web.ebscohost.com+delivery?hid=11&sid=b8e4829e-3cf6-467f-9bfb-3a612603027e@sessionmgr11&vid=6" \l "bib64)] The basic source of the problem is the sexual division of labour as humanity tries to divorce itself from nature through the productive system. Men predominate in the sphere of commodified production while the domestic sphere is serviced by women's unpaid labour. As a result, both women and men become alienated from each other and from their labour. The productive process itself is alienated from the natural world. The natural world is, in turn, transformed, eroded and polluted in the course of production for profit. Even so, the natural world remains the basis of human life. Nature is therefore both the necessary basis of human life and the result of historical and social forces. It is both a `natural' and a social construct. The same is true for gender. It is created both by biology and social practices.[ [65](https://stuiterproxy.kuleuven.be/ehost/,DanaInfo=web.ebscohost.com+delivery?hid=11&sid=b8e4829e-3cf6-467f-9bfb-3a612603027e@sessionmgr11&vid=6" \l "bib65)] Socialist ecofeminism therefore sees both the natural world and the human world as active agents, as material forces. Ecological and biological conditions, social production and reproduction are all forces creating and shaping human society. What is required, therefore, is a multilevelled structural analysis that sees a dialectical relationship between production and reproduction as well as between society and nature.[ [66](https://stuiterproxy.kuleuven.be/ehost/,DanaInfo=web.ebscohost.com+delivery?hid=11&sid=b8e4829e-3cf6-467f-9bfb-3a612603027e@sessionmgr11&vid=6" \l "bib66)] Socialist ecofeminism steers a course between a natural conception of `nature' and the idea of social construction as well as between patriarchy and capitalism as systems of exploitation.

### Science Link

#### The affirmatives science view is masculine in nature and allows for the domination of women, increasing poverty and natural destruction, global violence and repression of life.

Nhanenge 7 – Master of Arts at the development studies at the University of South Africa

(Jytte “Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the concerns of women,, poor people and nature into development” <http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/570/dissertation.pdf?sequence=1>)

The political links focus on social and scientific changes that took place in Europe in the 16th and 17th century. The modem world-view, which evolved as from that time on, specifically sanctioned the domination of women, Others and nature. This perception of reality has persisted up to date. It has also been successful in penetrating almost every corner of the globe, often via its activities of development and progress. Understanding the foundation of science and its inherent values is therefore of acute importance and highly relevant when it comes to grasping an ecofeminist discussion of development issues. This is based on the assumption that if the foundation of a system is dominant, then it must follows that the system in itself also will contain elements of domination. The critique of science presented here is therefore not meant as a goal in in itself. It is rather an essential and necessary foundation to chapter 6, which discusses ecofeminism and development. Consequently, Western science together with its economic framework and modem technology were the three pillars on which mainstream development came to rest. However, since science is based on a dualist ideology that focus on power and control of the yang force over the yin force, development became dominant towards women, Others and nature. In this way, an ecofeminist analysis of science may be able to explain, at least in part ,the reasons why development through 60 years of efforts failed to solve pressing social problems in the South. Rather than being the solution to the four crises, science, economics and modem technology have become the main causes of increased poverty, intensified natural destruction, and the escalation of global war, violence and human repression.

### **Tech Links**

#### The use of technology and engineering reinforces the gendered dichotomies

Faulkner 2k Science Studies Unit, Universtiy of Edinburgh

(Wendy. “The Technology Question in Feminism” a paper for publication in *Women’s Studies International Forum*, June 2000)

One obvious stream within feminist scholarship on technology concerns ‘women *in* technology’, most commonly the question ‘why so few?’ women in engineering. Despite nearly two decades of government and industry backed 'women into engineering' campaigns, the numbers entering engineering are still derisory in most countries, even compared with those going into science. Quite apart from any discrimination or discouragement they may face, most girls and young women are voting with their feet: it doesn't occur to them to get into either craft or professional engineering; they just aren't interested. The virtual failure of these initiatives indicates to me a failure to analyze critically the ways in which technology itself gets gendered in the eyes of would be technologists. In particular, I believe the continued male dominance of engineering is due in large measure to the enduring symbolic association of masculinity and technology by which cultural images and representations of technology converge with prevailing images of masculinity and power (eg, Caputi, 1988; Burfoot, 1996; Basalmo, 1998). Yet, consistent with the liberal feminist tradition, the 'women in technology' literature and campaigns view technology as gender neutral and as unequivocally 'a good thing' which women would enter into if only early socialization (e.g., to play with mechanical toys) and workplace structures (e.g., concerning childcare) were changed (Henwood, 1996).

#### Technology is created for economic incentives which leads to suffering via pollution. That excludes feminine values because it ignores the potentially devastating effects.

Nhanenge 7 – Master of Arts at the development studies at the University of South Africa

(Jytte “Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the concerns of women,, poor people and nature into development” <http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/570/dissertation.pdf?sequence=1>)

Modem technology is the means to generate economic profit. Since the greed of the Ups is pressing, the need to generate more wealth is urgent. This means that technologies commonly are developed in a rush, without careful consideration about the effects from its application. The result is that modem technology often causes pollution of both society and nature. This leads to serious suffering on the part of women, Others and nature. The rational individuals may notice these effects but since the priority is of economic profit making and the Downs anyway are considered of a lower value, the polluting activities are rationalized away as being necessary for the benefit of all. The rational individual has consequently no human empathy for the pain and suffering his activities are causing the dualised other. The reason for this is straightforward and simple: Human emotions of empathy, care and concern are feminine values, which are seen as being soft, naive, unimportant and disgraceful in the hard, rational, masculine, competitive, individual world.

### Nuclear Parlance

#### **Nuclear parlance creates and justifies nuclear weapons as a form of sexual domination**

Warren 1996 -- A scholar, and former Professor and Chair of Philosophy at Macalester College

(Karen, Toward an Ecofeminist Peace Politics, pg 8-9)

Stereotyping through "power dualisms of domination'14 occurs with both women and nature in language that is both sexist and naturist. Nuclear parlance employs 'nature language.' Nuclear missiles are stored on 'farms,' 'in silos." That part of the submarine where twenty-four multiple warhead nuclear missiles are lined up, ready for launching, is called 'the Christmas tree farm'; BAMBI is the acronym developed for an early version of an antiballistic missile system (for BAllistic Missile Boost Intercept). Nuclear parlance also uses female imagery, often in conjunction with naturalizing metaphors, to describe and refer to nuclear weaponry and strategies. In her wonderfully illuminating article, 'Sex and death in the rational world of defense intellectuals,' Carol Cohn describes her one year immersion in a university's center on defense technology and arms control. She relates a professor's explanation of why the MX missile is to be placed in the silos of the new Minuteman missiles, instead of replacing the older, less accurate ones: "because they're in the nicest hole you're not going to take the nicest missile you have and put it in a crummy hole' (Cohn 1989: 133). Cohn describes a linguistic world of vertical erector launchers; thrust-to-weight ratios, soft lay downs, deep penetration, penetration aids (devices that help bombers of missiles get past the "enemy's' defensive system, also known as apenaids"), the comparative advantages of protracted versus spasm attacks or what one military advisor to the National Security Council has called 'releasing 70 to 80 percent of our megatonnage in one orgasmic whump" where India's explosion of a nuclear bomb is spoken of as 'losing her virginity' and New Zealand's refusal to allow nuclear-armed or nuclear-powered warships into its ports is described as 'nuclear virginity' (Cohn 1989: 133-7). Such language and imagery creates, reinforces, and justifies nuclear weapons as a kind of sexual dominance. The incredible distortions of nuclear parlance are reinforced by such misnomer's as Ronald Reagan's dubbing the MX missile 'the Peacekeeper,' terminology whereby 'clean bombs' are those which announce that 'radioactivity is the only 'dirty' part of @g people' (Cohn 1989: 132) and the Pentagon position that human deaths are only "Collateral damage' (since bombs are targeted at buildings, not people). Such distortions leave little room for acknowledging, in nuclear parlance, a total disregard for the effects of nuclear technology on the natural environment or the objectionable female sexual domination metaphors used to describe and justify the deployment of nuclear weapons. An ecofeminist feminist peace politics can build on this important work already being done with regard to sexism, naturism, and nuclearism by showing how this language and imagery grows out of and perpetuates patriarchalism. Under patriarchalism, naturist-sexist language provides a historical justificatory strategy for domination (Adams 1990: 82).

#### Deep ecology is an exclusionary male practice, that assumes woman are equally to blame for the environment, although it stems from patriarchal men

Fox ‘4 [Warwick. November 22nd, 2004 "The Deep Ecology-Ecofeminism Debate and its Parallels." Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology 3rd Edition. Micheal E. Zimmerman, J. Baird Callicott, George Sessions, Karen J. Warren, John Clark. Prentice Hall: New Jersey. 2001. p218-235. <http://somethingaboutenvironmentalethics.blogspot.com/2004/11/deep-ecology-vs-ecofeminism.html>]

Ecofeminists have a few concerns about deep ecology. First, that deep ecology names anthropocentrism as the root cause of environmental problems. Ecofeminists believe that androcentrism (man-centeredness) is the root cause. To imply that women and men are equally to blame for environmental destruction is offensive to ecofeminists. A second concern is that deep ecology is inherently androcentric. Perhaps this stems from the fact that men created it or from the rational nature of the derivational system that many feminists find disadvantageous to women. Another concern is that deep ecologists support a sense of cosmological identification that views all things in the universe as part of an unfolding process. Ecofeminism promotes a personal sense of identification

## Impacts

#### **The domination that men impose is the root cause of all other hierarchies**

Brennan and Lo 2008 – Professor, Pro Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe University and Senior Lecturer at La Trobe University

(Andrew and Yeuk-Sze, Environmental Ethics)

Emphasizing the importance of feminism to the environmental movement and various other liberation movements, some writers, such as Ynestra King (1989a and 1989b), argue that the domination of women by men is historically the original form of domination in human society, from which all other hierarchies -- of rank, class, and political power -- flow. For instance, human exploitation of nature may be seen as a manifestation and extension of the oppression of women, in that it is the result of associating nature with the female, which had been already inferiorized and oppressed by the male-dominating culture. But within the plurality of feminist positions, other writers, such as Val Plumwood (1993), understand the oppression of women as only one of the many parallel forms of oppression sharing and supported by a common ideological structure, in which one party (the colonizer, whether male, white or human) uses a number of conceptual and rhetorical devices to privilege its interests over that of the other party (the colonized: whether female, people of colour, or animals). Facilitated by a common structure, seemingly diverse forms of oppression can mutually reinforce each other (Warren 1987, 1990, 1994, Cheney 1989, and Plumwood 1993).¶ Not all feminist theorists would call that common underlying oppressive structure “androcentric” or “patriarchal”. But it is generally agreed that core features of the structure include “dualism”, hierarchical thinking, and the “logic of domination”, which are typical of, if not essential to, male-chauvinism. These patterns of thinking and conceptualizing the world, many feminist theorists argue, also nourish and sustain other forms of chauvinism, including, human-chauvinism (i.e., anthropocentrism), which is responsible for much human exploitation of, and destructiveness towards, nature. The dualistic way of thinking, for instance, sees the world in polar opposite terms, such as male/female, masculinity/femininity, reason/emotion, freedom/necessity, active/passive, mind/body, pure/soiled, white/coloured, civilized/primitive, transcendent/immanent, human/animal, culture/nature. Furthermore, under dualism all the first items in these contrasting pairs are assimilated with each other, and all the second items are likewise linked with each other. For example, the male is seen to be associated with the rational, active, creative, Cartesian human mind, and civilized, orderly, transcendent culture; whereas the female is regarded as tied to the emotional, passive, determined animal body, and primitive, disorderly, immanent nature. These interlocking dualisms are not just descriptive dichotomies, according to the feminists, but involve a prescriptive privileging of one side of the opposed items over the other. Dualism confers superiority to everything on the male side, but inferiority to everything on the female side. The “logic of domination” then dictates that those on the superior side (e.g., men, rational beings, humans) are morally entitled to dominate and utilize those on the inferior side (e.g., women, beings lacking in rationality, nonhumans) as mere means.

#### **Men dominate and control women in the same way that nature is exploited and destroyed**

Forsey no date -- writer and activist

(Helen, Feminism and Ecology: A Matter of Survival, Natural Life Magazine)

I am not quibbling over the choice of words. The “drive to dominate and control” has typically been seen as a mark of manhood, and the threat it poses is far from new. For women, children, and other living things, it has always been dangerous.¶ The view of the universe described in the poster is certainly the one that predominates in our culture, but it is a view of reality as men tend to experience it. If we accept it as gender-neutral we are making a grave mistake.¶ Historians tell us that mechanistic science, which gave rise to modern industrial society, was very much a masculine enterprise right from the start, filled with explicit images of the all-powerful male mind conquering a female Nature. Women pacifists, suffragists and abolitionists have long pointed out the linkages between war, male dominance, and other oppressions. Today, ecofeminists extend those understandings to the environmental crisis, recognizing a common thread in the oppression of women, of nature, and of all those somehow defined by the dominant culture as “other”.¶ We don't necessarily have to use the terms “patriarchy” or “eco-feminism”, but we do have to acknowledge the reality and the connections. To deny them is to neglect a key set of contributing factors in the ecological crisis.¶ Images like “Mother Nature”, or “the rape of the Earth” reflect a view of Nature as female. In male-dominated cultures, this linkage can be harmful to both women and Nature: just as women are viewed as being there to serve men's needs, Nature is seen as existing for “man” to exploit at will. Within this patriarchal mentality, powerful men all too often use and abuse women and children, peasant and tribal peoples, and Nature itself, for their own short-term gain. This has led to the devastation of the natural environment and the further oppression of those who live most closely with it.¶ In the environmental movement itself, sexism, like other forms of oppression, seriously undermines our work. Sexist behavior at the personal level ranges from the use of sexist language or “jokes”, to discounting or trivializing women's input, to patronizing, objectifying, or ignoring us There are even cases of threats or outright exploitation of the trust built in a common cause. And it's hard to challenge a “brother” who is fighting in the trenches beside us against those nasty corporate and government enemies, especially if others pretend not to have seen or heard.

#### **Patriarchal mentality creates an escalation of violence against women**

Brinker 2009 – PhD

(Rachel, Dr. Vandana Shiva and Feminist Theory, Conference on Earth Democracy: Women, Justice, and Ecology)

“Ecofeminism” was a term first used by Francoise D’Eaubonne in 1980 and gained popularity in protests and actions against continued ecological disaster. Shiva and Maria Mies explain:¶ “We see the devastation of the earth and her beings by the corporate warriors, as feminist concerns. It is the same masculinist mentality which would deny us our right to our own bodies and our own sexuality, and which depends on multiple systems of dominance and state power to have its way” (14).¶ From Shiva’s perspective, women’s liberation cannot be achieved without a simultaneous struggle for the preservation and liberation of all life on this planet from the dominant patriarchal/capitalist worldview (Mies and Shiva, 16). Ecofeminism distinguishes itself from other theories of feminism, which maintain the hierarchical worldview of the Western world. “Rather than attempting to overcome this hierarchical dichotomy many women have simply up-ended it, and thus women are seen as superior to men, nature to culture, and so on” (Mies and Shiva, 5).¶ Shiva and other ecofeminists are explicitly anti-war and anti-capitalist, because both war and capitalism are seen as patriarchal structures. “The capitalist patriarchy perspective interprets difference as hierarchical and uniformity as a prerequisite for equality” (Mies and Shiva, 2). For Shiva there is connection between the escalation of war, “musclemen” culture, and rape and other violence against women. “It is no coincidence that the gruesome game of war—in which the greater part of the male sex seems to delight—passes through the same stages as the traditional sexual relationship: aggression, conquest, possession, control. Of a woman or a land, it makes little difference” (Mies and Shiva, 15).¶ The historical context that radicalized Vandana Shiva and many others was the Green Revolution and the vast globalization of the mid to late twentieth century. Shiva refers to this model of economic development as maldevelopment. “Maldevelopment militates against equality in diversity, and superimposes the ideologically constructed category of western technological man as the uniform measure of the worth of classes, cultures and genders” (Shiva, Staying Alive, 5).

#### **The logic of domination is what causes hierarchies and the oppression of women**

Warren and Erkal 1997 – A scholar and former Professor and Chair of Philosophy at Macalester College, and Erkal is has a PhD in Philosophy

(Karen and Nisvan, Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature, pg 21)

Barbara Smith articulates a feminist politics that challenges all forms of¶ social domination: “Feminism is the political theory and practice that¶ struggles to free all women: women of color, working-class women, poor¶ women, disabled women, lesbians, old women—as well as white, economically privileged, heterosexual women. Anything less than this vision of total freedom is not feminism, but merely female self-aggrandizement."¶ Ynestra King extends this analysis to include the domination of nature¶ prevalent in mainstream Western society: “[Ecofeminism's] challenge of¶ social domination extends beyond sex to social domination of all kinds,¶ because the domination of sex, race, and class and the domination of nature are mutually reinforcing.“¶ The term ecofeminism may seem to imply that ecofeminists are con-¶ cerned only about the oppression of women and the oppression of earth.¶ But,as Karen Warren argues, “Because all feminists do or must oppose¶ the logic of domination which keeps oppressive conceptual frameworks in¶ place, all feminists must also oppose any isms of domination that are main-¶ tained and justified by that logic of domination.“¶ Many ecofeminist theorists argue that there is no primary form of op-¶ pression, as all oppression: are related and reinforce each other. However,¶ depending on one’s position in society, there is often one form of oppres-¶ sion that seems most pressing in one's everyday life. For instance, King’s¶ statement that “domination of women was the original domination in hu—¶ man society,from which all other hierarchies—of rank,class,and political power--flow.

## The Alternative

### Ocean-gnosis Module

#### We must view the oceans as divine. Such ocean-gnosis is key to resolve our patriarchal domination of nature.

Harbold ’1. [Thomas H. Harbold, ecology author. Spiral Nature. “The Earth is a Witch: Ecofeminism, Deep Ecology, and the Pagan Movement.” http://www.spiralnature.com/spirituality/paganism/earthwitch.html]

"It is all real, it is all metaphor, there is always more." Wicca, and Paganism in general, is multifaceted and diverse in its perception of divine reality, as has been touched on in the main text. Some Witches, especially those coming from a radical feminist (Dianic) tradition, view the Goddess as the sole deity- image, whether seen as myth, metaphor, or objective being; others are radically poly theist, attributing objective, personal identity to the various deities of the numerous pantheons. The mainstream position in the Craft, however-insofar as it is possible to make such a generalization-is for a balanced polarity between "female" (Goddess) and "male" (God) energies. Even here, however, there are a wide variety of models by which that divine reality is understood. One of the most interesting of these, and one which would probably be embraced, at least in general terms, by a significant plurality of Witches and other Pagans is that put forward by Pagan Way in the 1970s. This was a celebratory/teaching ritual circle in New York which served as an "Outer Court" group in which those interested in learning more about the Craft could do so without investing the commitment of time and energy required by those seeking initiation into a coven. For some, it also served as a point of entry into a coven, but others seem to have attended Pagan Way rituals for years without getting deeper into the mysteries of the religion. Pagan Way defines three "Levels" of "the Gods of the Craft" (Fitch, pp. 11-12). Level 1 is "absolute Godhead-the level of transcendence, gnosis," at which level the ultimate unity of the divine nature is stressed; this could be seen as the level of philosophical or metaphysical monotheism. Level 2 brings out the "harmonious and creative duality of the God and Goddess." It is at this stage, most characteristic of Wicca as it is perceived by outsiders, that "the Absolute" becomes subjectively discernible through reason, emotion, etc., rather than merely via intuitive enlightenment or gnosis; at this level Wicca may be seen as duotheistic. Level three is the archetypal level, that to which "belong the gods and goddesses which are worshipped by the worldly religions"; it is at this level that Wicca and Paganism generally may be viewed as polytheistic religions. It is important to note that these levels are mutually complementary and inter woven, not mutually exclusive; all are "true" as models or methods of apprehending the divine reality, the question is merely of the approach one takes to the question. It is precisely this awareness, succinctly captured in the "it is all real, it is all metaphor, there is always more" assessment quoted at the beginning of this appendix, in which lies the greatest strength of Wicca and Paganism thealogically. The recognition that divine real ity, like mundane reality, is multifaceted and diverse, and may be apprehended through a variety of means, may be disorienting or disconcerting for those accustomed to a "one, true, and only way" model of religious "Truth." It is, however, intensely liberating for those seeking both ecological sanity and an end to patriarchal models of dominance. The tripartite "levels" model described above is, of course, only one way of conceptual izing this mytho-poetic, metaphorical, yet on some level "real" truth; the point is that this model points toward a way of looking at the world which has the potential to be vastly liberating. Such models allow us to, for example, venerate this good Earth not as a means to a "higher" end, but as its/herself an epiphany of the divine reality; to seriously engage the archetypal figures of the ancient pantheons in seeking out their lessons (both positive and negative) for today; to experience and internalize the ecstatic dance of union of the (metaphorically, not literally gendered) "female" and "male" energies of the Goddess and God; to stand in awe of That Which transcends all our normal, human ways of looking at reality. Such models allow us to choose any of these ways, or all of them, to aid us in our quest for ecopsychic harmony, to help us-first in our own lives, then in the wider world-to reweave the web which joins humankind, Nature, and God/dess.

#### Affirmation of nature as a transcendent, post-patriarchal unified being, as opposed to an object is uniquely key to end the technological assault of the 1AC.

Zimmerman ’90 [Michael E., professor of philosophy at the University of Colorado at Boulder. “DEEP ECOLOGY AND ECOFEMINISM: THE EMERGING DIALOGUE” http://www.dhushara.com/book/renewal/voices2/deep.htm#anchor2860962]

Many ecofeminists agree that the technological assault upon the Earth is the culmination of a direction in human history that took a particularly virulent form in Europe.8 In the Europe of several thousand years ago, before the emergence of agriculturally based cities and before the onslaught of the Goddess-slaying, Sky-Father-worshipping nomadic horsemen, there was no patriarchy. Society was apparently non-hierarchical, non-authoritarian, and non-dualistic. Human worship was directed at the Goddess, the female divinity regarded by women and men alike as the source of all life and bounty and goodness. Gradually, however, the Goddess was displaced by the new Father God. Feminists have often interpreted this new God as the projection of the male's hierarchical, patriarchal, domineering, and authoritarian attitude. While the Goddess affirmed the goodness and primacy of the body and the Earth, the God affirmed the goodness and primacy of the spirit/soul and heaven. But this is not the only possible interpretation of the Father God. C. G. Jung and psychotherapist Erich Neumann have argued that the emergence of the Father God was consistent with the development of human consciousness from out of a relatively collective state to one of increasing individuation.9 They see the solar God as representing the clarity of the free-willed, self-assertive, rational ego-self. For this kind of individuated selfhood to be possible, according to Jung, the heroic ego had to escape from the embrace of the Great Mother, who represents both the organic-bodily and the subconscious domain of human existence. Transpersonal psychologist Ken Wilber, however, argues that the emergence of the Father God amounted to a new level in humankind's understanding of divinity, a level consistent with and made possible by the Great Goddess-IO Wilber sees the Great Mother as representing early humanity's conception of "Mother Nature" as the now-bountiful, now-withholding source of life and death, who must be placated by ritual and blood sacrifice, while the Great Goddess represents the insight of a few into the transcendent Divine Unity that constitutes the creative source of all things. That is, the Great Goddess is the unifying principle of transcendence-in-immanence that makes even the Great Mother possible. Unlike the Great Mother, who demands ritual sacrifice, the Great Goddess requires not sacrifice of the body, but instead sacrifice or surrender of the separate self to the Divine Unity which is its source.

#### This mindset change solves patriarchy.

-answers deep ecology bad

Zimmerman ’90 [Michael E., professor of philosophy at the University of Colorado at Boulder. “DEEP ECOLOGY AND ECOFEMINISM: THE EMERGING DIALOGUE” http://www.dhushara.com/book/renewal/voices2/deep.htm#anchor2860962]

It appears then that the emergence of concern for the nonhuman world has coincided with the rediscovery of the Great Goddess in particular and of the Divine in general. In the quest to rectify the mistreatment of women, many feminists tended to neglect both the Earth and the Divine. To more and more women and men alike, however, it is becoming clear that the Divine cannot be identified with the patriarchal understanding of divinity. Moreover, we are beginning to realize that our capacity for caring for other human beings is somehow related to our capacity to appreciate the divinity at work in all of us. By appreciating the Divine God/dess, the origin and destiny of all things, we also appreciate more fully both our own bodies and the Earth upon which those bodies so depend. Surrendering to the Divine, we simultaneously surrender to and affirm our own embodiment. This Divine God/dess is simultaneously and paradoxically transcendent and immanent. Perhaps this concept of a post-patriarchal God/dess is necessary for women and men alike to develop a form of individuation that does not involve dissociation from the body, from nature, and from woman. This God/dess may then provide the understanding and compassion necessary for women and men to care for each other in a way that encourages us to care for other people and for the Earth as well. In this essay, I have attempted to develop a dialogue between deep ecology and ecofeminism. No doubt, masculine bias and phrasing color the writings of many deep ecologists, but a generous and compassionate interpretation of their work reveals an authentic concern to heal men and women and to heal the Earth that has been wounded by men and in some cases by women. Women and men alike have been distorted by the effects of patriarchy. What we need now is cooperation and trust, not animosity and suspicion, between deep ecologists and ecofeminists. We need each other in our common search for a way to be mature and complete human beings, so that the Earth can be freed from the burden of domination and exploitation.

#### Interrogating the beauty of nature is the ultimate form of connection to the environment.

Tøllefsen ’11 [Inga B., professor of philosophy at the University of Tromsø. “Ecofeminism, Religion and Nature in an Indian and Global Perspective.” Alternative Spirituality and Religion Review: Volume 2, Issue 1. http://uit.no/Content/276140/Ecofeminism\_Inga\_2011.pdf] Ecofeminism does also have a spiritual side, encompassing many expressions of feminist concern with religion based on nature. Sandilands (1991:93 in Besthorn and McMillen 2002) describes spiritual ecofeminism as …the resacralization of Nature, of the divine feminine inherent in all living beings. It is seen as part of a process of reconnection, a reestablishment of ways of knowing and being in the world that have been lost in the history of patriarchal domination. The Goddess, in myriad forms, represents an ultimate vision of connectedness… The idea that women are, because of their womanhood, spiritually close to nature is central to ecofeminist thought, and is manifested in many forms of (nature) religion—both in the west and the east—often in the form of worshipping the inner goddess that resides in women. There are many examples from the west, often closely connected to the New Age movement, and which can be placed under the umbrella of neo-paganism. Some of these are Wicca and feminist witchcraft, the druid tradition and neo-shamanism (Tøllefsen 2007). In neo-pagan discourse key concepts encompass strong emotional relations to nature, as well as a baseline pagan ethic, emphasizing free will and an imperative of doing no harm. The concept of gods and goddesses is also very much present in ecofeminist spirituality, and can be understood in two ways. On one hand both male and female goddesses can be present in the belief system, bringing together masculinity and femininity without the oppression of the female in traditional religion, and in society. On the other hand nature can be personified as a goddess, as Mother Earth. Spiritual ecofeminists, in Starhawk’s words “[…] do not believe in the Goddess—we connect with her; through the moon, the stars, the ocean.” This shows that some sides of ecofeminism are deeply spiritual, concerned about the sacredness in nature and the holism of humanity and everything living. Especially women’s connection to nature is seen as positive and transformational, a source of strength and celebration. If humanity can reaffirm its bond to nature, the hierarchies of difference and degradation can ideally be broken.

### Emotions over Reasons Module

#### Thus the alternative; we should reject the aff and the patriarchal mindset in favor of embracing emotions and caring in our attitude towards the environment

Kheel ’93 activist scholar

(Marti, “Wearing New Stories”, From Heroic to Holistic Ethics: The Ecofeminist Challenge, 26-28)

If the cult of masculinity has been modeled on the image of predation, the field of nature ethics has been modeled on that of protection. Both animal liberation and environmental ethics spring from a common defensive reaction to the willful aggression perpetrated upon the natural world. Animal liberationists concentrate much of their energies on protecting those animals reduced to the status of inert matter or machines--that is, animals in laboratories and factory farms. Environmental ethicists, by contrast, devote themselves primarily to protecting those parts of nature that are still "wild." But the underlying motive remains the same--namely, the urge to defend and protect. [17] Various modalities have been proposed for how the defense of nature might best be waged. Typically, nature ethicists have felt compelled to arm themselves with the force of philosophical theory in coming to nature's defense. Whereas patriarchal society has sought to destroy the natural world, nature ethicists have sought to place it under the protective wing of ethical theory. However, as Sarah Hoagland points out, predation and protection are twin aspects of the same world view: "Protection objectifies just as much as predation." [18] In their attempt to forge iron-clad theories to defend the natural world, nature ethicists have come to rely on the power and strength of a reasoned defense. Reason is enlisted as the new hero to fight on nature's behalf. In the past, humans (primarily men) have conceived of themselves as proprietors of the object-laden natural world. [19] Today, many nature ethicists conceive of themselves not as the owners of nature, but as the owners of value, which it is their prerogative to mete out with a theoretical sweep of their pens. Ethical deliberation on the value of nature is conceived more or less like a competitive sport. Thus, nature ethicists commonly view themselves as "judges" in a game that features competing values out of which a hierarchy must be formed. The outcome is that some must win and others must lose. If a part of nature is accorded high value (typically by being assigned a quality that human beings are said to possess, such as sentience, consciousness, rationality, autonomy), then it is allowed entrance into the world of "moral considerability." If, on the other hand, it scores low (typically by being judged devoid of human qualities), it is relegated to the realm of "objects" or "things," and seen as unworthy of "interests" or "rights." The conferral of value in ethical deliberation is conceived as the conferral of power. [20] "Inherent value" or "inherent worth" (the highest values) accrue to nature to the extent that nature can be rescued from the object world. [21] Much of the heated debate among nature ethicists occurs over what class of entities may rightfully be granted admittance to the subject realm. The presumption behind this conceptual scheme is that if an entity is not graced with the status of "subject," it will become the "object" of abuse. Both animal liberationists and environmental ethicists seek to curb the willful destruction of the natural world through another act of human will. Reason is, once again, elevated above the natural instincts and asked to control our aggressive wills. The same reason that was used to take value out of nature (through objectification and the imposition of hierarchy) is now asked to give it value once again. A sound ethic, according to this view, must transcend the realm of contingency and particularity, grounding itself not in our untrustworthy instincts, but rather in rationally derived principles and abstract rules. It must stand on its own as an autonomous construct, distinct from our personal inclinations and desires, which it is designed to control. Ethics is intended to operate much like a machine. Feelings are considered, at best, as irrelevant, and at worst, as hazardous intrusions that clog the "ethical machinery." Basing an argument on love or compassion is tantamount to having no argument at all. As Peter Singer boasts in his well-known Animal Liberation, nowhere in his book will readers find an appeal to emotion where it cannot be substantiated by rational argument. [22] In their attempt to forge iron-clad theories to defend the natural world, nature ethicists have, in many ways, come to replicate the aggressive or predatory conception of nature that they seek to oppose. They leave intact a Hobbesian world view in which nature is conceived as "red in tooth and claw," with self-interest as the only rule of human conduct. [23] The presumption is that only reason compels people to submit to sovereign rule--in this case, not that of a king, but that of ethical theory. Ethics, according to this world view, comes to replicate the same instrumental mentality that has characterized our interaction with the natural world. It is reduced to the status of a tool, designed to restrain what is perceived as an inherently aggressive will. Not all philosophers of nature have relied on axiological or value theory to rescue nature from her current plight. A number of writers, working in what some refer to as the field of ecophilosophy, [24] have sought to ground their philosophy not in the rational calculation of value, but rather in a transformed consciousness toward all of life. [25] Although they share with nature ethicists the urge to rescue nature from the object realm, they reject a "values in nature" philosophy in favor of grounding their philosophy in a particular phenomenological world view. Often the search for this transformed consciousness is described in terminology that borrows freely from the field of resource development. For example, we read of the search for the "conceptual resources" or the "foundations" of an environmental consciousness. [26] Although various religious and philosophical traditions have been proposed as suitable "resources" for the development of this consciousness, it is the images and metaphors of nature within these traditions that are the primary focus of concern. Some of the images and metaphors for nature that have been proffered as "fertile" grounds for the development of an environmental consciousness include that of an "interconnected web," "a community of living beings," an "organism," and an "expanded Self." The science of ecology has provided additional support for a world view that perceives all of life as an interconnected web or a single living being. The tendency of many ecophilosophers is to "mine" these conceptual systems for an ecological consciousness, rather than to examine their own feelings and emotions toward the natural world. [27] The underlying motive for the reconceptualization of the natural world is the urge to rescue nature from the aggression that is thought to ensue without these conceptual restraints. History has, in fact, shown that particular conceptions of nature have acted as a restraint against human aggression. As Carolyn Merchant points out: The image of the earth as a living organism and nurturing mother has historically served as a cultural constraint restricting the actions of human beings. One does not readily slay a mother, dig into her entrails for gold, or mutilate her body. . . . As long as the earth was considered to be alive and sensitive, it could be considered a breach of human ethical behavior to carry out destructive acts against it. [28] Many ecofeminists, inspired by the premodern conceptions of Gaia or "Mother Earth," have consciously sought to reclaim these images. [29] For most ecofeminists, however, this attempt to revive the image of Gaia is grounded not in systematic phenomenology but, rather, in a feeling of spiritual connection with the natural world. A female image of the earth simply seems to have resonance for many ecofeminists as a contrast to the patriarchal notion of a male sky god. [30] Yet the image of the earth as a living being is insufficient in and of itself to bring a halt to the current destruction of the natural world. The attempt by many ecophilosophers to graft a new image onto our current conception of nature fails to challenge the underlying structures and attitudes that have produced the image they seek to supplant. The underlying tendencies toward aggression that exist under patriarchy are thus left intact. The Gaia hypothesis, proposed by the scientist James Lovelock, illustrates this point. The hypothesis originally was hailed by ecophilosophers for reviving the notion of the earth as a living being. This initial enthusiasm, however, was subsequently tempered when Lovelock concluded that the earth, as a result of its self-regulating mechanisms, was perfectly capable of enduring humanity's insults. Lovelock boldly claimed, "It seems very unlikely that anything we do will threaten Gaia. . . . The damsel in distress [the environmentalist] expected to rescue appears as a buxom and robust man-eating mother." [31] With Lovelock's theory, the earth was "revived," but the underlying structures and attitudes that promote aggression were left unchallenged. Thus, although ecophilosophers have avoided some of the pitfalls of nature ethics, with its attendant notion of obligations and rights, they have often left unchallenged the deeper problem entailed in the notion of ethics as a form of restraint.

#### The only way to engage in effective holistic ethics is to disengage from patriarchal discourse, only then can we truly listen to and care for nature

Kheel ’93 activist scholar

(Marti, “Wearing New Stories”, From Heroic to Holistic Ethics: The Ecofeminist Challenge, 26-28)

In order to engage in holistic ethics, we must also disengage from patriarchal discourse. Patriarchal discourse creates dilemmas that it then invites us to resolve. Thus, animal experimenters typically invite us to answer the question, "Who would we save if we had to choose between our drowning daughter and a drowning dog?" The crisis scenario is designed to lead us to believe that only one life can be saved, and only at the other's expense. Disengaging from patriarchal discourse means that we must refuse to dignify these dualistic questions with a response. Even to consider such questions is to give support and validity to the patriarchal world view. [67] The best response to such questions is, perhaps, to pose a question of our own. We might ask why the child is ill to begin with. Was it due to the hormones found in the meat she was fed, or was it perhaps due to the consumption of drugs that had proved "safe" after testing on animals? And why was the proverbial dog touted by research scientists "drowning" to begin with? Had someone thrown the dog in the water (or, rather, the laboratory) in the pathetic belief that somehow, through the dog's death, a young child's life would be saved? And how and why did we develop a culture in which death is seen as a medical failure, rather than as a natural part of life? As we disengage from patriarchal discourse, we begin to hear larger and fuller stories. Hearing these bigger stories means learning to listen to nature. The voice of women and the voice of nature have been muted under patriarchy. Women and nature are considered objects under patriarchy, and objects do not speak, objects do not feel, and objects have no needs. Objects exist only to serve the needs of others. But despite our society's refusal to listen, nature has been increasingly communicating her needs to us. Nature is telling us in myriad ways that we cannot continue to poison her rivers, forests, and streams, that she is not invulnerable, and that the violence and abuse must be stopped. Nature is speaking to us. The question is whether we are willing or able to hear. [68] The notion of obligations, responsibilities, and rights is one of the tools used by heroic ethics. But genuine responsibility for nature begins with the root meaning of the word--"our capacity for response." Learning to respond to nature in caring ways is not an abstract exercise in reasoning. It is, above all, a form of psychic and emotional health. [69] Heroic ethics cannot manufacture health out of the void of abstraction. Psychic and emotional health cannot be manufactured at all. It can only be nurtured through the development of a favorable environment or context within which it can grow. The moral "climate" must be right. Ecofeminists and other nature writers have often proclaimed the importance of a "holistic world view." By "holism" they refer to the notion of the "interdependence of all of life." But interdependence is hardly an ideal in and of itself. A master and slave may be said to be interconnected, but clearly that is not the kind of relation that ecofeminists wish to promote. The quality of relation is more important than the fact that a relation of some kind exists. If our society is to regain a sense of psychic health, we must learn to attend to the quality of relations and interactions, not just the existence of relations in themselves. Thus, when hunters claim to promote the well-being of the "whole" by killing individual animals, or to "love" the animals that they kill, we must challenge their story. Our own notion of holistic ethics must contain a respect for the "whole" as well as individual beings.

#### **We should use emotion over reason to solve our problems. If we always use rational to engage our problems we create a world where we focus on the masculine dominate trait.**

Nhanenge 7 – Master of Arts at the development studies at the University of South Africa

(Jytte “Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the Concerns of Women, Poor People and Nature into Development” <http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/570/dissertation.pdf?sequence=1>)

When a human being is examined from a holistic perspective, it becomes clear that people's actions are based on emotions rather than rationality. There is nothing like satisfaction of emotional needs that can motivate a person. Rationality alone is on the other hand a poor motivator for action. However, in the final analysis emotion and reason are two integrated parts of a whole human being. They should therefore not be seen as separate entities. Patriarchy, however, believes that reason and emotion can be completely detached. Based on this false assumption patriarchalism the masculine faculty of rationality. Superior reason is therefore used to suppress inferior emotion, and to rationalize away the disastrous consequences from application of an exaggerated masculine force. The result of such false beliefs is that political leaders and business people are pursuing economic profits due to their unsatisfied emotions. They develop a greedy approach to life, because they lack affect and have been forced to repress emotional needs. However, to save face they argue that it is rational and therefore good. In order to compensate for inadequate emotional satisfaction they pursuit maximization of economic profit, material acquisition, advanced technology and power. Such people find it rational to expand economic growth, arguing that it will alleviate poverty. However, in reality economic growth is not rational It is oppositely highly irrational since it is causing poverty for women, Others and nature. It is founded on the treasured patriarchal human characteristics of competition, maximization, greed, self-interest and individualism. Since these masculine, rational traits lack a dynamic tension with the complementary but opposite feminine emotional forces of cooperation, optimization, conservation, community, and social care they become exaggerated and destructive. This destruction is manifested in the four crises. To generate harmony inside a person, among people, and between people and nature the human mental function of reason must be balanced with the dualised, opposite, but complementary human emotion. Reintegrating the full human mental faculty is important in order for people to understand themselves. A human being will not succeeded in becoming a happy, healthy and harmonious person as long as society teaches that a person is superior, only when he or she is defined and act as being masculine. Masculinity is only one part of a person which cannot stand alone. It needs to be seen in a dynamic tensions with its complementary feminine part. Thus, a person is much more than only rational. If the emotional side is undermined, a person will never fully know him or herself. That would be a huge loss. It would prevent a person from becoming a balanced, whole human being, who can venture into the world with an open mind and deal appropriately with challenges that come his or her way. Oppositely, a fragmented, rational human being, cannot know him or herself. Lack of self-knowledge will lead the person to commit "stupid actions", the consequences of which will roll on forever and ever and lead to unhappiness, destruction and crises. It is therefore necessary that a person is defined as a whole human being. To function, a person needs to develop nationality as well as emotions. Only then will the person be able no deal with the challenges of the world, including amelioration of the current crises. Such a new, holistic anthropology must be pan of development studies. Development studies are a multi-disciplinary subject that includes the economic, political and social aspects of people's realities. However, the mental or psychological reality of people is lacking, when it should be an integrated part of the studies. Only few development authors have included the mental (emotional) aspect of the people they study in their research. Robert Chambers was perhaps one of the first to make psychology a natural part of his work. However, also E. F. Schumacher focused on the full human being and his feelings in the development context. Since then more development academics have joined, but seen from a subjective point of view, most authors in development studies still focus on masculine, quantitative issues and objects, rather than on a quality of life for real people. Many for example still argue that "political will" can solve development problems. These people consequently lack the insight that this concept does not exist in human psychology. Politicians are human beings who are motivated to act according to their individual emotions, rather than due to their political rationality. lf they have suppressed their emotions, they will not be able to feel empathy or care for women, Others and nature. They consequently will not be motivated to alleviate poverty, even though they may have plenty of political will. It is for this reason political leaders decide that their own economic advantage is more important thanEnding the rape and genocide of women and Others in the Darfur region. It is also for this reason that Leaders in the World Bank and managers of multinational corporations find it economical to place polluting activities in the Third World. When women, Others and nature are harmed or killed by the poison, compensation is cheap and profit is high. Since emotions is the dualised other and empathy is part of these inferior feminine feelings, showing care and concern for women, others and nature is no what a superior, rational, masculine individual does. Instead, he rationalizes the human suffering away: He may argue that the dualised other is lazy or stupid and should therefore be seen as a lower leveled being that has little economic to lose and who is happy with some handouts. He may see women and Others as being passive and hence responsible for their own misery. He may believe that had these others only done as the Ups, then they would not belong to the Downs. Women and Others are therefore seen as being inferior ones who deserve subordination. Thus he falls into the trap psychologists call for "blaming the victim". That is easier than to examine oneself. Conclusively, as shown throughout the dissertation, rationality cannot prevent domination, exploitation and violence of women, Others and nature. Scientific rationality is in fact promoting these violent trends. When we understand ourselves enough to realize that, it is our human feelings that drive us rather than our rationality then we can reconcile our fragmented selves and find peace. When we get in touch with our emotions then we have a good chance to develop as human beings and become respectable, caring, balanced and happy persons. Such a person would not permit that children live in poverty, he would also not abuse other adults, neither would he rape women nor kill anyone. He would also not destroy nature. Due to his inner balance, he would not need to commit such atrocities. Hence, when we include the full spectre of our human faculty, we may be able to develop caring relationships between men and women, adults and children, white and blacks, humans and nature and we would find that rational. The outcome of knowing ourselves and pursuing inner balance may in the end, result in a world without crises and "development problems". Ecofeminism is a struggle for survival of people, nature and the future generations of both categories. In order to succeed in this a new anthropology is required. It must be one, which can define human beings as a whole person, hence integrating the masculine reason with the feminine emotion. When we are fully integrated people, we would not need to bring up our children by the traditional means of reward and punishment. The abuses against children need to stop. It is inhuman and cruel. Only when we get in contact with our own emotions will we be able to understand the suffering of these children, and end it. Caring for children means that they can grow up, becoming caring adults. This is highly likely leading to a non-dominant, non-violent world. This is another challenge for development studies. It could play an important role in promoting a new anthropology that includes emotion and ensures that children are cared for. As Robert Chambers already has pointed out, improving childrearing in a development context, is essential in order to promote a future generation of people that will care about women, Others and nature. Conclusively psychology deserves to play a central role in development studies.

### **Indigenous Knowledge Module**

#### **Thus the alternative, we should reject the affirmative in favor of the ecofeminist model of plural knowledges and the use of indigenous knowledge in eco-ethical decisions**

Nhanenge 7 – Master of Arts at the development studies at the University of South Africa

(Jytte “Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the Concerns of Women, Poor People and Nature into Development” <http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/570/dissertation.pdf?sequence=1>)

8.3.3. Perceiving indigenous knowledges as relevant is needed: Knowledge is about knowing oneself, other people, nature and things in one's surroundings. It is therefore not an activity that belongs to experts. In spite of that, modern science was created as a monopoly that belongs to the patriarchy. Being a measure of control science was introduced as a rational, universal and objective system of knowledge that presents the truth about reality. Thus, science excluded the experiences and knowledges of women, poor people and indigenous peoples. These people's perception of life was considered the lowest kind of knowledge. Hence dualism and its domination of women, Others and nature included their knowledges. Apart from being a means created to control and dominate, science was also meant as a tool to exploit nature for economic profit of patriarchy. In this way, science, with its reductionist focus on quantities, its persistent abuse of nature, and its exclusion of the experience of women and Others, has lead to the condition that created the four crises. Since resolving the global crises requires improving the quality of life for women, Others and nature, science will be inadequate as a tool. Instead the perceptions, experiences and knowledges of women, Others and nature are essential. Ecofeminism has challenged the exclusion of ecology and feminism from a scientific understanding life. It has instead suggested alternative, holistic ways of thinking and knowing. The aim is to dismantle the domination of women, Others and nature and to see reality from an ecological and feminist point of view. Hence, people's experiences, and their feelings about what happens in the process, should be the foundation of knowledge. According to this alternative perception, knowledge relates to a particular perspective that is situational, contextual, subjective and affectional. It is interdependent with people’s environments and based on a historical process related to a specific culture. Such situated knowledges are based on diverse experiences, with no universal or single view. It is relevant knowledges that will help women, Others and nature to produce, reproduce and sustain their quality of life. It is therefore a kind of knowledge, which will alleviate poverty and regenerate nature. This is knowledge to which outsiders normally do not have access, acquiring it therefore demands a humble attitude in learning from local people. This is not easy and quite an opposite scenario from the usual situation where the scientifically educated outsider teaches local peoples the absolute truth about their indigenous reality. An ecofeminist model of plural knowledges is different from the singular reality promoted by the modern world-view. This means that situated knowledges are threatening the monopoly of science, its disciplines, its technology and its institutions. If local knowledges are recognized, then science cannot anymore be considered the carrier of absolute truth. Instead, it becomes only one perspective of various "truths". Such a move would be part of dismantling the power-base of patriarchy. However, many people have been socialised into believing in the superiority of science and the universality of scientific institutions, change towards a plural perception of reality will therefore be painful and come hard. This is where development studies come in. In order to alleviate poverty and regenerate natural health, it is necessary that the quality of life of women, Others and nature is improved. Since this requires inclusion of indigenous knowledges, development studies must support it. Such support may include researches into and documentations of how indigenous knowledges can increase the quality of life for women, Others and nature. If studies would clearly show its effectiveness in poverty alleviation, they may spread awareness of the importance of indigenous knowledges. This may convince some flexible development agencies about its relevance and persuade open-minded development workers to take local people's experiences seriously. Such awareness will develop slowly, but it is a step further towards the goal of including in development, reality as perceived from the perspectives of women, Others and nature. Or said differently: being aware of the importance indigenous knowledges play in poverty alleviation means that any development activity that would overlook the experiences of feminism and ecology must be considered a reductionist, masculine and dominant enterprise, the outcome of which will only reinforce the four crises. Conclusively indigenous knowledges play an important role in improving the quality of life for women, Others and nature. It is therefore an appropriate challenge for development studies to promote that realities, experiences and knowledges of women, traditional peoples, and poor people, together with ecological knowledge are integrated in any development endeavour as being both legitimate and relevant knowledges.

#### **Indigenous environmental practices enable the use of holistic environmental ethics**

Coward, Brunk, and Power-Antweiler ’07 Professors at the Centre for Studies in Religion and Society at the University of Victoria

(Harold, Conrad, and Melanie, “Ecosystem Justice as an Ethical Basis for Fisheries Management”, American Fisheries Society Symposium 49, <http://fisheriessociety.org/proofs/wfc/power-antweiler.pdf>, 589-590)

The Haida Approach: The Haida writers Russ Jones and Terri-Lynn Williams-Davidson in their essay y “Applying Haida Ethics in Today’s Fishery” (Jones and Williams-Davidson 2000) argue that the Haida fishing communities on Canada’s west coast followed a traditional approach that fostered ecosystem justice in the fishery. According to Jones and Williams-Davidson, “First Nations around the world demonstrate interwoven cultural, spiritual, and ecological values derived from spiritual principles embedded in nature” ” (Jones and Williams-Davidson 2000:102), and the Haida approach to the fishery is based on a spiritual relationship with their natural environment and all its elements, including fish, birds, land animals, creeks, and places. The Haida place animals at an equal and sometimes higher level than humans. This contrasts strongly with western European policy and law, which is human-centered and values the fish in terms of their use by humans. The Haida believe that all animate and inanimate beings have a spirit, which translates into holistic ethical approach to the utilization of the resources of the land and sea. The creatures of the oceans are regarded as Ocean People, and each creature is thought to play an important part in keeping the rest of nature alive. Interactions between the Haida and the Ocean People are for sustenance or to play an important part in keeping the rest of nature alive. Interactions between the Haida and the Ocean People are for sustenance or spiritual reasons. Thus, fish are seen as making an important sacrifice to keep humans alive. Thus, “a fisher would talk respectfully to the halibut, referring to it as a k’aagaay, or elder, while asking it to bite his hook” (Jones and Williams-Davidson 2000:103). Two important principles of Haida ethics are respect and reciprocity. Respect is taught for oneself, others, and the environment that keeps us alive. This is manifested in a variety of ways. Offerings are made to honor the spirits of the fish that we intend to kill. All fish that are killed must be treated respectfully, which means it must not be wasted (all parts must be used). Sports fishing, where a fish is played (caught and then released), is offensive to the Haida (Jones and Williams-Davidson 2000). Food must be handled with care. Ceremonies are held, such as a gathering at the mouth of the Yakoun River to welcome back the first sockeye salmon (Jones and Williams-Davidson 2000). Haida individuals or clans also follow a stewardship or management responsibility with regard to fish that seeks to actualize a holistic or ecosystem relationship with nature. Clans traditionally controlled fishery access within their territory; on behalf of the clan, the chief was the steward of the resource and had the responsibility to see that it was not overfished. Another guiding principle for Haida conduct is a sacred quest for balance that is embodied in the Haida proverb “The world is as sharp as the edge of a knife,” a story in which a man, responsibility to see that it was not overfished. Another guiding principle for Haida conduct proud of walking along a narrow board just above the ground, nevertheless slipped and fatally fell (Jones and Williams-Davidson 2000). This speaks to the narrow relationship not only between life and death, but also between humans and nature, analogous to the two side of a knife, and it teaches the importance of finding balance in all of our activities, including stewardship of the fishery. Current Haida management of fisheries incorporates traditional spiritual values with moder scientific techniques in management and decision making, For example, the Haida fishery on the Copper River on Haida Gwaii takes place over a short period of time in April and May. The river is the traditional territory of the Gitksan clan, who owned the single trap on the river-others had to request permissions to fish there. Today, all Haida living in Skidegate can fish the river. The fishery is managed as follows. “The target escapement is 10,000 spawners to the river, and the Haida Fisheries Program operates a continuing fence and makes recommendations on fisheries openings. Public meetings are called each year to appointment a management committee to make decisions on opening…The public meeting involves all interested people and includes a mix of elders, men and women. Decisions are made by consensus but may be delegated in season to the management committee. Fence counts and catches are followed closely by everyone and reported in the local village newsletter. If an opening is called, fishing effort might consist of up to 50 nets that take annual catches averaging 3,300 sockeye…The Copper River fishery is an example of a carefully managed fishery that uses a public community consensus process and traditional and scientific knowledge to make decisions” (Jones and Williams-Davidson 2000:109). By following Haida values, which treat the fish and people as spiritual beings that are parts of a holistic interdependent environment, the Haida follow a model of ecosystem justice in their approach to the fishery. Their community-based decision making is one example of how a comanagement model based on the ethical assumptions of ecosystem justice can work effectively.

## Aff Answers

### Essentialism

#### The K essentializes oppression and its attempt to disrupt hierarchies merely recreates different hierarchies and recreates the violence they talk about on different populations and leads to an oppression olympics – turns the K

Armbruster 99 – Associate Professor of English @ Webster University

(Karla, Chapter 5: A Call for Boundary-Crossing in Ecofeminist Literary Criticism, Ecofeminist Literary Criticism: Theory, Interpretation, Pedagogy, p 98)

The path between continuity and difference that ecofeminist theorists must walk is so narrow and difficult not because of inadequacies in the theorists or the theories, but because of the complexity of their task. Ecofeminism explicitly works to challenge dominant ideologies of dualism and hierarchy within Western culture that construct nature as separate from and inferior to human culture (and women as inferior to men).3 While many ecofeminists identify such ideologies primarily as masculine, such a characterization is overly simplistic; as Val Plumwood explains, "it is not a masculine identity pure and simple, but the multiple, complex cultural identity of the master formed in the context of class, race, species and gender domination, which is at issue" (5). The ideologies of dualism and hierarchy that ground all these dominations are such pervasive forces within our culture that even a movement with the most subversive motives and concepts cannot help but reflect their influence. Within ecofeminism, an unproblematized focus on women's connection with nature can actually reinforce the "master" ideologies of dualism and hierarchy by constructing yet another dualism: an uncomplicated opposition between women's perceived unity with nature and male-associated culture's alienation from it. On the other hand, an unbalanced emphasis on differences in gender, race, species, or other aspects of identity can deny the complexity of human and natural identities and lead to the hierarchical ranking of oppressions on the basis of importance or causality.

#### Essentialization destroys alts solvency and reifies patriarchy and environmental destruction

Armbruster 99 – Associate Professor of English @ Webster University

(Karla, Chapter 5: A Call for Boundary-Crossing in Ecofeminist Literary Criticism, Ecofeminist Literary Criticism: Theory, Interpretation, Pedagogy, p 101)

Central to the ecofeminist agenda is the goal of individual, social, and ideological change—specifically, change that will improve the cultural standing of women and nature. As I have suggested, one of the primary problems that essentialism can cause for ecofeminists is that, in many ways, it seems antithetical to change. An identity based on essential qualities is unchanging, and the ways essentialist connections between women and nature support dominant ideologies also limit ecofeminists' capacity to catalyze social and cultural change. One way that ecofeminists such as King and Griffin support the possibility of change is through their acknowledgment of the historically and socially constituted nature of the (female) subject. In taking this view of subjectivity, they share one of the widely accepted insights of poststructuralist thought. Growing out of the work of thinkers such as Derrida and Foucault, the poststructuralist view that ideological forces construct our subjectivities through discourse can be interpreted as allowing for the possibility that individuals, and thus culture, can change in a way that essentialist views of identity do not allow.9

#### Ecofeminism excludes and demonizes men and fails to address alt causes to oppression

Merchant 92 - PhD History of Science @ University of Wisconsin at Madison

(Carolyn, Chapter 8: Ecofeminism, *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World*, P 193-194)

Cultural ecofeminism, however, has its feminist critics. Susan Prentice argues that ecofeminism, while asserting the fragility and interdependence of all life, “assumes that women and men ... have an essential human nature that transcends culture and socialization.” It implies that what men do to the planet is bad; what women do is good. This special relationship of women to nature and politics makes it difficult to admit that men can also develop an ethic of caring for nature. Second, ecofeminism fails to provide an analysis of capitalism that explains why it dominates nature. "Capitalism is never seriously tackled by ecofeminists as a process with its own particular history, logic, and struggle. Because ecofeminism Iacks this analysis, it cannot develop an effective strategy for change." Moreover, it does not deal with the problems of poverty and racism experienced by millions of women around the world." In contrast to cultural ecofeminism, the social and socialist strands of ecofeminism are based on a socioeconomic analysis that treats nature and human nature as socially constructed, rooted in an analysis of race, class, and gender.

#### Essentializing oppression and explaining all oppression as coming from subjugation of women and nature cant change society and stops pragmatic change from occurring and creates an oppression olympics that fractures resistance to oppression

(Karla, Chapter 5: A Call for Boundary-Crossing in Ecofeminist Literary Criticism, Ecofeminist Literary Criticism: Theory, Interpretation, Pedagogy, p 104)

Of course, it is necessary for ecofeminists to stress that both the oppression of women and the domination of nature possess deep roots in Western culture, but the categorical assertion that any form of oppression is the ground of all others does little to challenge the ideologies responsible for dominations of all sorts. Although it is necessary to separate forms of oppression to discuss them, such a hierarchical and static approach goes beyond a sensitivity to difference to become a rigid code specifying which forms of difference should take political priority over others. 12 By giving in to the desire to establish such a code, even consciously antidualistic writers such as King and Griffin effectively enthrone gender and association with nature as the aspects of identity most vulnerable to oppression, thus implying that identity can be dissected into self-contained units that can be evaluated for severity of oppression. This need to rank aspects of difference inevitably alienates those who are fore- grounding aspects of identity—such as race or sexual orientation—different from those selected as most oppressed. Thus, difference is again displaced rather than destabilized, serving to separate people from each other and from nature instead Of encouraging them to form alliances for change on the basis of shared aspects of identity and experiences of oppression.

### K is too Western

#### Their critique assumes western women globally which ignores multiple factors of identity which only helps the rich west women

Gaard 10 – English Prof @ University of Wisconsin-River Falls

(Greta, Strategies for a Cross-Cultural Ecofeminist Literary Criticism, Ecozone, p 49-50)

As Susin Moller Okin's volume, Is Multiculturalism Bad For Women? points out, under the rhetoric of multiculturalism, appeals for respecting social practices that require women's subordination have been advanced, and such appeals have been used strategically to block feminist critiques across cultures. But sexism is a historic part of most cultures—not a unique feature of a particular culture, dominant or subordinate, West or East, first-world or two-thirds world—and it must be uprooted if women are to enjoy true freedom and equality within that culture. In developing cross-cultural feminist and ecofeminist literary critiques, it may be possible and even necessary to advance some minimum general statements about women's conditions, needs and rights globally. Transnational human rights organizations from Oxfam, ENTICEF and Amnesty International, to Women Living Under Muslim Laws, along with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, argue that oppression will not be legitimated with appeals to culture or tradition. These generalizations about women must take into consideration intra-cultural differences of class, region (urban/rural), ethnicity, and sexuality. Particularly in the contemporary novels I selected for comparative reading, "globalization" often means westernization, and such westernization can be perceived simultaneously as a form of cultural, economic, technological, ecological, and political that improves the lives of the middle and upper classes while bypassing or even harming the lives of poor, working class, or impoverished Chinese and Taiwanese Because the process of globalization is currently in motion, contemporary literary texts provide snapshots of characters and cultures in transition, creating plots that retain traditional values and beliefs about family, ancestors, spirituality, sexuality, and nature at the same time as they articulate westem values and practices of sexuality, economics, and technology as taken on by the upwardly-mobile classes.

### Ecopragmatism

#### Perm solves best – Eco-pragmatism allows for concrete change and theoretical approaches

Butler 1 – Law Professor @ William and Mary

(Lynda, "Book Review of Eco-Pragmatism: Making Sensible Environmental Decisions in an Uncertain World," Faculty Publications, p 407)

Much of the debate over environmental protection has been presented as a choice between conflicting alternatives: a choice, for example, between environ- mental quality and economic efficiency, between command and control regulation and private market approaches, and between endangered species and jobs. What often is missing from this theoretical and normative debate is a middle University of Minnesota professor Daniel Farber brings the middle ground into the debate in his book Eco-Pragmatism: Making Sensible Environmental Decisions in an Uncertain world. As the title suggests. Farber's Eco-Pragmatism takes a moderate approach to resolving the core issues involved in making hard environmental decisions. Instead of joining the battle between competing holistic theories being fought in the environmental arena, Farber advocates the adoption of a pragmatic approach to environmental problem solving. Basing his approach on legal pragmatism, Farber explains that a pragmatic approach draws on the herence of many sources, rather than on a single unified foundation" and uses theories as "tools, not ends in themselves" (p. 10). Much of the book is devoted to making the case for moderate, pragmatic approach. Farber uses key problems involved in making hard environmental decisions as his organizational tools. Those problems include deciding how to make trade-offs between conflicting values, deciding how to deal with the time dimension of environmental problems, and deciding how to respond to uncertainty about risk. Farber examines the problem Of making by comparing the two principal methods for making social decisions: politics and the market. According to Farber, the current debate over these methods has become bogged down in some "very deep philosophical waters" (p. 40). A more helpful approach, in Farber% view, would be to think of economic concepts as tools for resolving disputes Over resource allocation. As Farber explains, both individual preferences and political choices should be important to environmental decision making. Because Of the strong commitment to environmental protection already expressed through the political process, decision makers should begin with an environmental baseline, allowing environmental harm "only when avoiding it is infeasible or grossly disproportionate in cost" (p. 68). Farber proposes limiting the role of economic methods like cost-benefit analysis to assisting rather than controlling the decision-making process, in hopes that economic tools will act as a check on unreasonable regulation without overtaking the decision-making process.

#### Pragmatism and feminism are intrinsically linked.

McKenna 01 (Erin McKenna, Erin McKenna is a Professor of Philosophy, former Chair of Philosophy and former chair of Women's Studies. She specializes in feminist theory and American Pragmatism, focusing on issues of social and political philosophy, November 13, 2001, The task of Utopia: A pragmatist and feminist perspective, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers)

The deﬁnition and scope of utopia are much debated. The full scope of this debate is not the focus of this work, though.‘ I use Lyman Tower Sargents deﬁnition of “a non-existent society described in considerable detail” to support my selection of the feminist novels discussed in this book. I am, however, also concerned with the social and political theory that informs, and is represented by, such ﬁctional societies. These theoretical perspectives are utopian in the sense that they present dreams of an alternate, and hopefully in some respects better, way of founding and organizing society.’ “Utopia is about how we would live and what kind of a world we would live in if we could do just that. . . . Sometimes utopia embodies more than an image of what the good life would be and becomes a claim about what it could and should be."‘°,I will discuss three models of utopia-end-state, anarchist, and process—from both the theoretical perspective of what could and should be and the ﬁctional perspective of a non-existent society. In other words, I will try to merge theory and (potential) practice." Both pragmatist and feminist theory reject the notion of theory and practice as separate. They understand theory as arising out of and guided by practice and practice as arising out of and guided by theory. This dialectical interchange energizes and enlivens both how we think and how we live. While the societies discussed here are imaginary potential societies, they do show people living out complex theoretical perspectives. This merging of theory and practice is one of the ways in which this study is feminist. Further, to provide the reader with a common focus and to assist with the clarity of the comparison of the three models of utopia, I have chosen to discuss only feminist utopian novels which seek to address the problems male violence (in various forms) pose for women and the world. These novels bring to life, while simultaneously critiquing, a variety of feminist perspectives. This leads to the difficulty of deﬁning feminism. As with utopia, there is no single deﬁnition of what is feminist and a full discussion of this debate is not the focus of this work." I use a basic definition: the belief that the subordination of women is wrong, that the absence of women's perspectives distorts and limits traditional social and political theory, and that addressing male bias in both theory and practice will result in a society more inclusive of diversity.” The pragmatist and feminist perspective will, specifically, reject the traditional dualisms of academic philosophy which include male/female, mind/body, reason/emotion, objective/subjective, and theory! practice. For both pragmatists and feminists, experience is essential to forming theory and knowledge is inﬂuenced by one’s situatedness. I refer to the process model of utopia as a pragmatist and feminist model in order to highlight these commonalities and to demonstrate the ways in which pragmatism is inherently feminist and the ways feminism, in all of its diversity, can be informed and modiﬁed by pragmatism."

### Deep Ecology Turn

#### Ecofeminism according deep ecology is anthropocentric and as a result creates the degradation of the environment, any act via the K erodes values.

Opara 11(Chioma Opara, Opara is a professor and Coordinator of English, Rivers State University of Technology, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.With specialization in Comparative Literature and Gender, her research interests include women and cultural studies, November 2011, Bridging Gaps, Dismantling Walls: A Case for Integrative Global Dialogue, Volume 2)

Biodiversity, a facet of ecofeminism is therefore a negation of Cartesian anthropocentric postulate that only beings with souls should merit one’s critical attention. Rene Descartes propounded the non-status theory which subordinates creatures without souls. This has generated a lot of debates among modern philosophers and theorists who contend that this non-status theory is the matrix of environmental degradation. Deep ecology, an aspect of environmental theory has been criticized within the ecofeminist movement as being insensitive to human and animal pain in the, biotic community‟ of nature.14 Indian ecofeminist, Vandana Shiva, observes of the third world environment, “the violence of nature, which seems intrinsic to the dominant development model, is also associated with violence to women who depend on nature for drawing sustenance for themselves, their families, their societies”. Given the unique socio-culturally prescribed role of the third world woman, any act of violence on nature erodes her spirit and vitality.

#### Ecofeminism's focus on solving human interconnection is inherently anthropocentric, and is the root cause of all environmental harms.

Fox ‘4 [Warwick. November 22nd, 2004 "The Deep Ecology-Ecofeminism Debate and its Parallels." Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology 3rd Edition. Micheal E. Zimmerman, J. Baird Callicott, George Sessions, Karen J. Warren, John Clark. Prentice Hall: New Jersey. 2001. p218-235. http://somethingaboutenvironmentalethics.blogspot.com/2004/11/deep-ecology-vs-ecofeminism.html]

Deep ecologists and ecofeminists are often at odds. Ecofeminists have a few concerns about deep ecology. First, that deep ecology names anthropocentrism as the root cause of environmental problems¶ Many deep ecologists would agree that men, whites, capitalists, and/or Westerners have been most to blame for environmental problems. However, they do not believe that the gender should be more focused on than the others. Also, they believe that to focus on gender, or any human interconnection, over environmental issues is passively anthropocentric. Ecofeminists believe that once androcentrism is remedied, that environmental problems will be solved in turn. Deep ecologists believe that no human interconnection should be put before solving the environmental problems themselves.

### Racism Alt Cause

#### Feminism isn’t the question or has the correlation between ecology, the question is racism and how it wasn’t until this was revealed the ecological movement became apparent.

Taylor 97 (Dorceta E., PhD Professor of Sociology, Program director for Minority Environmental Leadership development initiative" 1997 Women of Color, Environmental Justice, and Ecofeminism" in Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature pp.38-81)

People of color have brought the issues of environmental racism, environmental equity, environmental justice, environmental blackmail, and toxic terrorism to the forefront of the environmental debate in recent year. Until people of color made these issues commonplace in environmental circles, the terms, the concepts they embody, and the questions arising from them were not used, explored, or asked by traditional, well-established environmental groups, deep ecologists, social ecologists, bioregionalists, ecofeminists, or Greens. Environmental activists (even the more radical ones and those who were critical of traditional environmental activism) ignored or paid little attention to the processes, practices, and policies that led to grave inequities, to charges of environmental racism, and to a call for environmental justice. For a long time environmentalists did not recognize that certain issues and activities had disproportionate negative impacts on communities of color; if they were aware of the impacts, they paid no attention to them. This occurred because many in the environmental movement failed to perceive and define issues affecting communities of color as environmental issues, did not consider people of color to be part of the constituency they served, or did not see themselves engaging in environmental dialogues and struggles with such communities. If and when they considered people of color, these people were an afterthought deserving only marginal consideration. Many environmentalists were too concerned with other issues to move issues affecting primarily people of color to the top of their agendas.

#### To first understand the negative connections of our society and the environment we must trace ourselves back to the problem of racism.

Merchant 10 (Carolyn Merchant, PhD History of Science University of Wisconsin at Madison, Professor of Environmental History, Philosophy, and Ethics, June 19, 2010, Environmental history: Shades of Darkness, Vol 8 num 3) K.A.

IN THE HIDDEN WOUND, published in 1989, environmentalist Wendell Berry writes that ‘the psychic wound of racism has resulted inevitably in wounds in the land, the country itself.’ When he began writing the book in 1968 during the civil rights movement, he tells us, ‘I was trying to establish the outlines of an understanding of myself, in regard to what was fated to be the continuing crisis of my life, the crisis of racial awareness.” Berry's book is an effort to come to terms with the environmental history of race as reﬂected in his family's history as slaveholders, in his own childhood on a Kentucky farm in the segregated South, and in his adult life as a conservationist and environmentalist.‘ in recent years, environmental historians too have reflected on the crisis of racial awareness for the field and collectively have begun the process of writing an environmental history of race. The negative connections between wilderness and race, cities and race, toxics and race, and their reversal in environmental justice have been explored by numerous scholars who have analyzed the ideology and practice of environmental racism. Throughout the country many courses now include multicultural perspectives on the environment.‘ We have learned important new ways to think about the relationship between race and environmental history. These include the following perspectives: - Slavery and soil degradation are interlinked systems of exploitation, and deep-seated connections exist between the enslavement of human bodies and the enslavement of the land. Blacks resisted that enslavement in complex ways that maintained African culture and created unique African American ways of living on the land.‘ - Native Americans were removed from the lands they had managed for centuries, not only during settlement. as is well known, but during the creation of the national parks and national forests. Indians resisted these moves in an effort to maintain autonomy and access to resources.‘ - American lndians and African Americans perceived wilderness in ways that differed markedly from those of white Americans! - A ‘coincidental order of injustice”-in Jeffrey Romm's phrase—reigned in post-Civil War America as emancipated blacks in the South were expected to pay for land with wages at the same time that free lands taken from Indians were being promoted to whites via the Homestead Act and other land acts.‘ - African Americans bore the brunt of early forms of environmental pollution and disease as whites fled urban areas to the new streetcar suburbs. Black neighborhoods became toxic dumps and black bodies became toxic sites. Out of such experiences arose African American environmental activism in the Progressive Bra and the environmental justice movement of the late twentieth century.’ All of this work is an auspicious beginning to compiling an environmental history of race. But we need to do much more in integrating multicultural history and environmental justice into our courses and frameworks. We especially need more research on the roles of African Americans in the southern and western U.S. environment and in early urbanization and more research on Asian and Hispanic practices and perceptions of nature.‘ I hope to contribute to this growing body of literature by looking at views held about American Indians and African Americans in environmental history. if an environmental justice perspective is to permeate the field of environmental history. we need to be aware of the racial ideas of the contributions of the founders of the conservation and environmental movements. I shall argue that whiteness and blackness were redefined environmentally in ways that reinforced institutional racism.